

twelve tribes of Israel." Luke xxii, 29-30. I wish I could impress upon all minds something of the grandeur of that kingdom, it will be fully established when one united voice of saints and angels shall proclaim "*Alleluia* : for the Lord God our omnipotent reigneth." Rev. xix, 6. We are now approaching the time of the fulfillment of the new part of this dual meal in the kingdom of God for the next that we hear is, "*write*." "Blessed are they who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb." And, who will be there? Not those I fear who have from time to time tried by the most insidious and cowardly methods to rob the church of ordinance that typifies this glorious consummation, for I am not ignorant of these devices and it is a noted fact that thus far all who have tried to gradually and stealthily eliminate this soul cheering ordinance from the practice of the church have met their downfall in some way or other, either in whole or in part.

Thank God the new part of this dual meal will be perpetuated in the church unto the day of its fulfillment in spite of the treachery of men in the church, of infidels out of the church or of the devils of hell—and when the call is finally made, "Come to the marriage" there will be such an assemblage as will be innumerable, it will be made up of all the righteous, from Abel down to the end of time. The church composed of those who faithfully "kept the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ," and those who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," will constitute the Bride, while the angels will be the servants, and the millions who died in infancy and the poor benighted heathen who had not the law of God, but were "a law unto themselves" who did right as nearly as they could by the law of nature, will constitute the guests. And such a company as that will be! whatever, wherever or however the ceremonies may be I want to be there, and I shall ever contend for the ordinance in the church that typifies this grand and glorious event and I hope the pitiable effort to make this supper as nearly nothing as possible as has repeatedly

been attempted will soon be abandoned.

I will now try to show why the evangelists differ somewhat in the use of the name of this dual meal.

Matthew wrote his gospel only six years after the occurrence of the events, and he uses the old name "passover," exclusively. Mark wrote his gospel ten years after the event and he does the same; they had the old name and its associations more firmly stamped upon their minds and the new part and its name had not yet impressed them. Luke wrote his gospel about twenty-two years after the eventful night, and by this time the Christian name and practice had to some extent familiarized themselves with his mind and he calls it both passover and supper. John wrote his gospel about sixty years after the night in which they ate the dual meal and he calls it exclusively by its proper Christian name, Supper. It must be remembered that the new dispensation with its service, names and practices, was not suddenly but gradually comprehended by the apostles and evangelists, and by the time that John wrote his gospel the old Jewish name and associations had been overshadowed in the minds of Christians by the new parts and name of the dual meal. To his mind all was clear; he was one of the parties who prepared the meal and he, by this time, comprehended it in all its parts, although sixty years before he called the same meal passover that he now calls supper.

Now I ask in all candor, which time was he right, and which time wrong? How shall we solve this problem? Admit the duality of the meal and it solves itself and there is no other way under heaven to solve it to the satisfaction of a discriminating mind. John when telling about this meal says it was "*before* the feast of the passover" when this supper was eaten and that Christ was on trial the next day which was the day of the preparation of the passover. Note this fact, that when John speaks of the feast intended to be celebrated by the Jews he invariably calls it "the passover" and when he speaks of the meal which he sixty years ago called passover, he invariably calls it "supper" at the time of the writing of his gospel.

Paul in writing to the Corinthians probably fifty years after the meal was instituted calls it "the Lord's Supper." No more passover in it, yet, fifty years earlier, three of the evangelists with Christ himself call it passover, and evidently meant all that was implied in the term. Again I say, there is no way under heaven, nor above it to reconcile this apparent contradiction to the satisfaction of a discriminating mind, only by admitting the duality of the meal and taking them to mean the old Jewish part when they say passover; and as meaning the new, the Christian part, when they say supper. Peter calls it feast of Charity which when a little more literalized is *Lovefeast*, this is what it really is, this is its powers, this is what makes it indispensable to the success of the church. Love for the "Brotherhood" for *all* the members, great and small, high and low, old and young, rich and poor, black and white, *all*, *ALL*, feast together upon a common level, without any distinction whatever, though some be so poor that they cannot contribute one penny toward the expenses of the feast they have the same privileges at the Lovefeast as the millionaire. Wealth cannot give the poor man this welcome but *love can*, and will; then hold fast to this blood-bought blessing to the church,

#### THE LOVE FEAST.

One more point in the investigation requires my attention; that is the claim that, if Christ kept the passover, it must have been before the legal time, and this would have made him a transgressor. That he kept it must be admitted. That he kept it before the legal time, I also admit. But that by so doing he became a transgressor I by no means admit, in fact, I have hardly the necessary patience to give such a claim respectful attention. Do we believe that Christ is divine? That he is omnipotent? How then dare we claim that he could transgress? The thing is as impossible as it is for God to lie.

Away with this insidious germ of infidelity, we must cultivate a better faith, and higher idea of the character of Christ than this amounts to, if we expect him to save us, and admit us to the "marriage supper of the Lamb". "For this man (Christ) was counted